Micromechanical study revealing the strong influence of the asymmetry in plastic flow of the incompressible matrix on void evolution and ductility of porous polycrystals
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Abstract

In this paper, the influence of the tension-compression asymmetry of the plastic flow of the incompressible matrix on porosity evolution and ultimately on the overall ductility of porous metallic materials is assessed for the first time. To this end, micromechanical finite-element analyses of three-dimensional unit cells are carried out. The isotropic plastic flow of the matrix (fully-dense material) is described by a criterion that accounts for strength-differential effects, yet is pressure-insensitive. Simulation results are presented for macroscopic axisymmetric tensile loadings corresponding to fixed values of the stress triaxiality for the two possible values of Lode parameter. It is shown that for the same imposed macroscopic stress loading, the distribution of the local plastic strain and local stresses in the porous material is strongly influenced by the value of a macroscopic material parameter $k$, which accounts for the particularities of the plastic flow of the matrix. This in turn affects any aspect of damage accumulation, and most importantly the overall ductility of any given material. Irrespective of the triaxiality, it is shown that for porous materials for which the matrix tensile strength is larger than its compressive strength, under loadings corresponding to $\mu_\Sigma = 1$, the void growth rate is much faster than in the case of loadings at $\mu_\Sigma = -1$. The opposite holds true for materials with matrix tensile strength lower than its compressive strength.
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1. Introduction

Ductile failure in metals occurs due to the presence of defects such as voids, microcracks (McClintock, 1968). The ability to accurately describe the evolution of voids in a ductile metal is essential for predicting its failure. Beginning with the pioneering studies of Needleman (1972), Tvergaard (1981), Koplik and Needleman (1988), micromechanical finite-element (FE) analyses of unit cells have been used to provide a better understanding of the mechanical response of porous solids (e.g. Richelsen and Tvergaard, 1994, Zhang et al., 2001; Srivastava and Needleman, 2012, etc.). In all these micromechanical studies, it was assumed that the plastic flow of the matrix (void-free material) is governed by the von Mises criterion.

Finite-element cell model calculations as well as analytical criteria for porous solids with plastically compressible matrix have also been proposed. For example, for the case when the matrix obeys Drucker-Prager pressure-sensitive criterion, FE calculations of yielding of the porous solid were reported by Trillat et al. (2006) while analytical criteria were developed by Barthelemy and Dormieux (2004), Guo et al. (2008), etc. It is to be noted that in all these models the strength-differential effects (SD) or tension-compression asymmetry in the plastic flow of the matrix are due to the sensitivity of yielding to mean stress.

However, for certain metallic materials SD effects or tension-compression asymmetry is observed although no volume changes accompany yielding (e.g. for Mg and its alloys, see Khan et al. 2011; for Ti and its alloys, see Nixon et al., 2010; Gilles et al., 2011). The fact that a material can display SD effects although its plastic flow is insensitive to the mean stress was explained by the single-crystal plastic deformation mechanism being sensitive to the sign of the shear stress. Early on, in their seminal theoretical study Hosford and Allen (1973) demonstrated that for deformation by twinning alone, the yield stress in uniaxial tension of a randomly oriented FCC polycrystal should be about 25% lower than that in uniaxial compression, the effect being just the opposite for BCC twinning. If the FCC material deforms by crystallographic slip and twinning, the difference between the uniaxial yield stresses in tension and compression is smaller but
of the same sign (for more details, see Hosford, 1993). Also, if the plastic deformation by crystallographic slip does not obey the classical Schmid law, a polycrystalline material may display a slight tension-compression asymmetry (see results on columnar ice reported by Lebensohn et al., 2009; simulations for polycrystalline molybdenum reported by Groger et al., 2008, etc.). Few studies have been devoted to the study of porous solids with incompressible matrix displaying SD effects. Using a kinematic limit-analysis approach, Cazacu and Stewart (2009) demonstrated that even a very small difference between the uniaxial yield in tension and compression of the plastically incompressible matrix has a dramatic influence on the yielding of the porous material. In contrast to the case when the matrix is described by the von Mises yield criterion (i.e. Gurson-type yield surfaces), Cazacu and Stewart (2009) yield surface does not display the usual symmetry properties, for example, the predicted yield stress under hydrostatic tension is different from the yield stress under hydrostatic compression; furthermore there is a very strong effect of the third-invariant of stress on yielding of the porous medium. This in turn, should have a drastic influence on the evolution of porosity.

The main goal of this work is to investigate the influence of the particularities of the plastic flow of the incompressible matrix, namely its tension-compression asymmetry, on the evolution of porosity and ultimately on the ductility of the porous material. To this end, a micromechanical FE study is conducted. The porous medium is represented as a three-dimensional (3-D) regular spatial array of initially spherical voids packed in a fully dense cubic structure. The matrix is considered to be elastic-plastic, the plastic response being described by the isotropic form of Cazacu et al. (2006)’s yield criterion. This yield criterion is pressure-insensitive. It involves all principal values of the stress deviator (or equivalently depends on both invariants of the stress deviator), and a scalar material parameter, \( k \), which depends only on the ratio between the uniaxial yield stresses in tension and compression of a given material.

The outline of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 the plasticity model for the matrix is summarized and the micromechanical unit-cell model and the method of analysis are discussed. In Section 3-4 are presented full-field three-dimensional (3-D) simulation results for porous materials with incompressible matrix characterized by several tension-compression strength ratios. For each porous material, the macroscopic loadings imposed
are such that the principal values of the macroscopic stresses, $\Sigma_1$, $\Sigma_2$, $\Sigma_3$, follow a prescribed proportional loading history corresponding to a constant stress triaxiality $T_\Sigma$. Specifically, the dilatational response is investigated under axisymmetric loadings ($\Sigma_1=\Sigma_2$) where the axial overall stress is adjusted so that a fixed ratio $\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1$ is maintained. Detailed analyses are presented for a moderate value of the triaxiality $T_\Sigma =1$. To investigate the effects of the third-invariant of the stress deviator or Lode parameter on the mechanical response of the porous solid, tensile loadings corresponding to the two possible orderings of the principal stresses i.e. ($\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2$ and $\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 2.5$) and ($\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2$ and $\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 0.4$), which correspond to Lode parameter $\mu_\Sigma = +1$ and $\mu_\Sigma = -1$, are considered. It is shown that for the same imposed macroscopic stress loading, the distribution of the local plastic strain and local stresses in the porous material is strongly influenced by the value of the macroscopic material parameter $k$, which accounts for the particularities of the plastic flow of the matrix. This in turn affects any aspect of damage accumulation, and most importantly the overall ductility of the material. Furthermore, irrespective of the triaxiality, the calculations show that for porous solids with an incompressible matrix with tensile strength larger than its compressive strength, under loadings corresponding to $J^\Sigma_3 >0$ ($\mu_\Sigma =1$) the void growth rate is much faster than in the case when the imposed loadings are such that $J^\Sigma_3 <0$ ($\mu_\Sigma = -1$). The opposite holds true for materials with matrix tensile strength lower than its compressive strength. The main findings of this study and concluding remarks are given in Section 5.

2. Problem Formulation and Method of Analysis

2.1. Yield criterion for plastically incompressible matrix displaying tension-compression asymmetry

The purpose of this study is to investigate the influence of the tension-compression asymmetry of the plastic flow of the matrix on porosity evolution and the overall ductility of an isotropic porous solid. To this end, we consider that the plastically incompressible
matrix is described by the isotropic form of Cazacu et al. (2006) criterion. This criterion is expressed as:

$$\sigma_T = \sqrt{\frac{9}{2(3k^2-2k+3)}} \sum_{i=1}^{3} (|\sigma_i'| - k\sigma_m')^2$$

(1)

where $\sigma_1', \sigma_2', \sigma_3'$ are the principal values of the deviator of the Cauchy stress tensor, $\sigma' = \sigma - \sigma_m I$; with $\sigma_m = \text{tr}(\sigma) / 3$ denoting the mean stress and $I$ the second-order identity tensor, while $\sigma_T$ is the yield stress in uniaxial tension. The only material parameter involved in the criterion is the parameter $k$, which is intimately linked with specific single-crystal plastic deformation mechanisms (e.g. see Lebensohn and Cazacu, 2012). Its range of variation is [-1,1]. For example, if the constituent grains of an FCC polycrystal with uniform texture deform by \{111\}<110> slip obeying Schmid law, plastic flow has no tension-compression asymmetry, i.e. the yield stress in uniaxial tension, $\sigma_T$, is the same as the yield stress in uniaxial compression, $\sigma_C$, the parameter $k$ in Eq. (1) is zero and the isotropic form of Cazacu et al. (2006) criterion reduces to the von Mises criterion. If twinning contributes to plastic deformation of the constituent grains, the polycrystal displays strength differential effects and $k \neq 0$, which means that the plastic flow depends on the sign and ordering of all principal values of $\sigma'$ or alternatively on both invariants of the stress deviator. For example, for a fully-dense isotropic FCC polycrystal that deforms at single-crystal level only by \{111\}<112> twinning, Hosford and Allen (1973) showed that the plastic flow is pressure-insensitive but the ratio between the yield stresses in uniaxial tension and compression is: $\sigma_T / \sigma_C = 0.83$. These results obtained with a Taylor-type crystal plasticity model were very recently confirmed by full-field calculations (see Lebensohn and Cazacu, 2012). The ratio $\sigma_T / \sigma_C = 0.83$ corresponds to $k = -0.3$ (see Eq. (1)). In Fig 1 (a) is shown the projection in the octahedral plane (plane normal to the hydrostatic axis, $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = \sigma_3$) of the yield criterion given by Eq. (1) for $k = -0.3$ in comparison with the von Mises yield criterion, which corresponds to $k = 0$ ($\sigma_T / \sigma_C = 1$), respectively. On the other hand, for a fully-dense BCC polycrystal, for which the constituent grains deform by \{112\}<11\overline{1}> twinning, the macroscopic yield
stress in uniaxial tension is larger than in uniaxial compression, $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21$ (the reciprocal of the ratio for the FCC polycrystal) which according to the criterion given by Eq. (1), corresponds to $k = +0.3$ (minus the FCC value). Projection of the yield locus for the fully-dense BCC polycrystal ($k = +0.3$) is given in Fig. 1(b) along with the von Mises criterion. Note the strong dependence of the yield loci on the third-invariant of the stress deviator as evidenced by their shape (i.e. triangles with rounded corners while the projection of the von Mises yield criterion is a circle).

2.2. Unit-cell model

Full three-dimensional (3D) FE cell model computations are conducted. It is assumed that the porous polycrystal contains a regular and periodic 3-D array of initially spherical voids. The inter-void spacing is considered to be the same in any direction. Thus, the unit cell, which takes into account the periodicity of the porous medium, is initially cubic with side lengths $2C_0$ and contains a single spherical void of radius $r_0$ at its center. The initial porosity is:

$$f_0 = \frac{\pi}{6} \left( \frac{r_0}{C_0} \right)^3.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

Cartesian tensor notation is used and the origin of the coordinate system is taken at the center of the void (see Fig. 2 (a)). Let $\mathbf{u}$ denote the incremental displacement between the current and reference configuration, and $\mathbf{t}$ the prescribed Cauchy stress vector, defined on the current configuration. Symmetry conditions are imposed on the planes $x = 0, y = 0,$ and $z = 0$, respectively:

$$u_1(0, y, z) = 0, \quad t_2(0, y, z) = 0, \quad t_3(0, y, z) = 0,$$

$$u_2(x, 0, z) = 0, \quad t_1(x, 0, z) = 0, \quad t_3(x, 0, z) = 0,$$

$$u_3(x, y, 0) = 0, \quad t_1(x, y, 0) = 0, \quad t_2(x, y, 0) = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

Therefore, only one eight of the unit cell needs to be analyzed numerically (see Fig. 2 (b)). To simulate the constraints of the surrounding material, we enforce that the faces of the
unit cell, which are initially planes parallel to the coordinate planes, remain planes and shear free. The boundary conditions imposed on the faces of the unit cell are:

\[
\begin{align*}
    u_1(C_0, y, z) &= U_1^*(t), \quad t_x(C_0, y, z) = t_z(C_0, y, z) = 0, \\
    u_2(x, C_0, z) &= U_2^*(t), \quad t_1(x, C_0, z) = t_3(x, C_0, z) = 0, \\
    u_3(x, y, C_0) &= U_3^*(t), \quad t_1(x, y, C_0) = t_2(x, y, C_0) = 0.
\end{align*}
\]  

(4)

The time histories of the displacements, \(U_1^*(t)\), \(U_2^*(t)\), and \(U_3^*(t)\) in Eq. (4) are determined by the analysis in such a way that the macroscopic Cauchy stresses \(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \Sigma_3\) follow a prescribed proportional loading history that is given by:

\[
\frac{\Sigma_1}{\Sigma_2} = \frac{\rho_1}{\rho_2} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\Sigma_1}{\Sigma_3} = \frac{\rho_1}{\rho_3},
\]  

(5)

where \(\rho_1, \rho_2\) and \(\rho_3\) are prescribed constants. The macroscopic true stresses \(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \Sigma_3\) are defined as:

\[
\begin{align*}
    \Sigma_1 &= \frac{1}{C_2C_3} \int_{0}^{C_1} \int_{0}^{C_i} t_1 \, dz \, dy, \\
    \Sigma_2 &= \frac{1}{C_1C_3} \int_{0}^{C_i} \int_{0}^{C_i} t_2 \, dx \, dy, \\
    \Sigma_3 &= \frac{1}{C_1C_2} \int_{0}^{C_i} \int_{0}^{C_i} t_3 \, dx \, dy,
\end{align*}
\]  

(6)

where \(C_i = C_0 + U_i^*\) are the current cell dimensions. The void is considered to be traction-free. The porous material being isotropic, its mechanical response is fully characterized by the isotropic invariants of the overall stress, i.e.:

\[
\begin{align*}
    \Sigma_m &= \frac{1}{3} (\Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2 + \Sigma_3); \quad \Sigma_\epsilon = \sqrt{3 J_2^x} = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2} (\Sigma_1^2 + \Sigma_2^2 + \Sigma_3^2)}; \quad J_3^* = \Sigma_1' \Sigma_2' \Sigma_3'.
\end{align*}
\]  

(7)

where \(\Sigma_i' = \Sigma_i - \Sigma_m, i = 1...3\). The following combinations of the above stress invariants will be used in the analysis, the stress triaxiality ratio \(T_\Sigma\) defined as the ratio between the first and second stress invariants, i.e. \(T_\Sigma = \Sigma_m / \sqrt{3 J_2^x}\) and the Lode parameter \(\mu_\Sigma\) (see
Drucker, 1949): \( \mu_e = \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{2} \cdot \frac{J^E_3}{(J^E_2)^{3/2}}. \) The overall (macroscopic) principal strains and the macroscopic von Mises equivalent strain \( E_e \) being calculated as:

\[
\begin{align*}
E_1 &= \ln \left( \frac{C_1}{C_0} \right), \\
E_2 &= \ln \left( \frac{C_2}{C_0} \right); \\
E_3 &= \ln \left( \frac{C_3}{C_0} \right) \quad \text{(8)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
E_e^2 = \frac{2}{3}(E_1^2 + E_2^2 + E_3^2),
\]

where \( C_0 \) and \( C_i, i=1\ldots3 \) are the initial and current cell dimensions.

We conclude the presentation of the FE unit cell model, with a comment concerning the FE implementation of the above boundary value problem. In the FE implementation, the degrees of freedom of all FE nodes belonging to the same planar bounding surface of the cubic surface are associated in the global stiffness matrix, and the equations of all these degrees of freedom are replaced by only one unknown variable. In this way, it is ensured that all initially planar boundary surfaces remain strictly flat during the entire loading history. Additionally, for each time increment and for all equilibrium cycles, the three imposed macroscopic forces on each planar bounding surface of the cubic cell are continuously updated in order to assure the specified macroscopic Cauchy stress ratios on the final equilibrated configuration; the macroscopic non-equilibrated forces are introduced in the fully-implicit Newton-Raphson algorithm in order to improve its convergence rate. Finally, a convergence criterion imposes that, for each planar surface, the ratio between the norm of the difference between the prescribed and effective macroscopic forces and the norm of the prescribed macroscopic force must be smaller than 0.001.

In this investigation, we focus on void evolution for overall axisymmetric loading, i.e. \( \rho_1 = \rho_2 = \) constant (see Eq. (5)). At the end of each time increment, the condition of constant proportionality between the true stresses is strictly verified, so it is ensured that the macroscopic stress triaxiality, \( T_\Sigma \), remains constant throughout the given deformation history. We will analyze in detail the case when the imposed \( T_\Sigma = 1 \) for the two possible orderings of the principal values of the applied macroscopic stress, i.e. for cases: (a) \( \Sigma_1 = \)
\( \Sigma_2 \) and \( \Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 2.5 \), which corresponds to \( \mu_\Sigma = 1 (J^r_3 > 0) \), and (b) \( \Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2 \) and \( \Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 0.4 \), which corresponds to \( \mu_\Sigma = -1 (J^r_3 < 0) \). For the loadings (a), two principal values of the stress deviator \( \mathbf{\Sigma}' \) are compressive (negative), but the maximum principal value is tensile (positive) while for loadings (b), two principal values of \( \mathbf{\Sigma}' \) are tensile (positive), but the minor principal value, which is compressive (negative), has the largest absolute value.

The void volume fraction, \( f \), is evaluated at the end of each time increment as:

\[
f = 1 - \frac{V_{\text{matrix}}}{V_{\text{cell}}}. \tag{9}
\]

In the above equation, \( V_{\text{cell}} = \text{C}_1 \text{C}_2 \text{C}_3 \), where \( \text{C}_i \) denote the current dimensions of the cell, while the volume of the deformed matrix, \( V_{\text{matrix}} \), is determined directly from the integration of the FE domain using the FE formulation (\( V_{\text{matrix}} = \sum_{i=1}^{N_E} V_i \), where \( V_i \) is the volume of the element \( i \) and \( N_E \) is the total number of finite elements in the mesh).

Using the FE cell model, the response of porous materials characterized by (\( k = -0.3 \) in Eq. (1)) and (\( k = 0.3 \) in Eq. (1)) and a porous Mises material (\( k = 0 \)) having the same initial void volume fraction, \( f_0 = 0.0104 \) (which corresponds to \( r_0/\text{C}_0 = 0.271 \)) will be investigated. It is to be noted that in all the computations, only the material parameter \( k \) is varied. All the other input material parameters are kept the same, i.e. the elastic properties (\( E= 200 \) GPa, \( \nu = 0.33 \), where \( E \) is the Young modulus and \( \nu \) is the Poisson coefficient) and the material parameters involved in the isotropic hardening law describing the evolution of the matrix tensile yield strength with local equivalent plastic strain, \( \bar{\varepsilon}^p \), i.e.

\[
Y = A(\varepsilon_0 + \bar{\varepsilon}^p)^n, \tag{10}
\]

where \( Y \) is the current matrix tensile flow stress, \( A \), \( n \) and \( \varepsilon_0 \) are material parameters.

The numerical values of these parameters are: \( Y_0 = 400 \) MPa, \( A = 728.22 \) MPa, \( n = 0.1 \), \( \varepsilon_0 = 0.00037 \). It follows that all the differences in behavior between the porous materials are due solely to the specificities of the plastic flow of the matrix, which are described by the macroscopic parameter \( k \).
The FE analyses were performed with DD3IMP (Menezes and Teodosiu, 2000, Oliveira et al. 2008), an in-house quasi-static elastoplastic FE solver with a fully-implicit time integration scheme. Figure 2 shows the initial FE mesh of one-eighth of the unit cubic cell consisting of 12150 elements (8-node hexahedral finite elements; selective reduced integration technique, with 8 and 1 Gauss points for the deviatoric and volumetric parts of the velocity field gradient, respectively) and a total of 13699 nodes. A mesh refinement study was carried out to ensure that the results are mesh-independent.

3. Analysis of the porosity evolution and its effects on the ductility of porous materials for axisymmetric tensile loading corresponding to \( T_\Sigma = 1 \) and \( \mu_\Sigma = 1 \) (\( \Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2 \) and \( \Sigma_3 / \Sigma_1 = 2.5 \))

Using the FE cell model, we first examine the porosity evolution and its effects on the mechanical response of the porous materials for proportional tensile loading corresponding to constant ratios: \( \Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2 \) and \( \Sigma_3 / \Sigma_1 = 2.5 \). This loading corresponds to a constant macroscopic stress triaxiality \( T_\Sigma = 1 \) (triaxiality in tensile loading of blunt notched specimens, see also Tvergaard and Needleman, 1984) and a constant value of the Lode parameter \( \mu_\Sigma = 1 \) (\( J_3^x > 0 \) during the entire loading history). Fig. 3 shows a comparison between the macroscopic effective stress-macroscopic effective strain (\( \Sigma_e \) vs. \( E_e \)) curves of the three porous materials; Fig. 4 shows the evolution of the void volume fraction, \( f \), while Fig. 5 depicts the rate of void growth as a function of the macroscopic effective strain \( E_e \). In each figure, for each material, the onset of failure is marked by a black dot while an open circle is indicative of final collapse. For all materials, the macroscopic strain \( E_e \) corresponding to the onset of failure is determined by monitoring the evolution of the cell's cross section that sustains the largest load (for the macroscopic imposed loading, the cell’s cross-section perpendicular to the axial axis, Oz). As an example, for the porous material characterized by \( k = +0.3 \), in Fig. 6 is depicted the \( \ln[C_0^2/(C_1C_2)] \) vs. \( E_e \) curve (solid line), as well as the evolution of its first derivative, i.e. \( \delta \ln[C_0^2/(C_1C_2)] \) vs. \( E_e \) (interrupted line). The onset of failure corresponds to the strain at which there is a visible change in the slope of \( \ln[C_0^2/(C_1C_2)] \) vs. \( E_e \) curve, while failure or
total collapse is considered to take place when the $\delta \ln [C_0^2/(C_1C_2)]$ vs. $E_e$ curve reaches a value close to zero (see also the discussion in Koplik and Needleman, 1988); this procedure for the determination of the onset of failure and final collapse was established based also on the observation of the kinematics of the deformation process determined numerically. In addition, adopting this definition of both the onset of failure and failure, contributes to a more objective comparison between different materials and loading cases. For each material, in Fig. 7 is highlighted the critical phase of the deformation process, where accelerated damage accumulation occurs (i.e. from the onset of failure to final collapse).

It is clearly seen that all aspects of the macroscopic response of the porous materials are influenced by the specificities of the plastic flow of the matrix. Specifically, the maximum effective stress that is reached, the onset of failure, the maximum strain (i.e. the material's ductility) strongly depend on the value of the parameter k (see Fig. 3). It is worth noting that the porous material characterized by $k = -0.3$ ($\sigma_T/\sigma_c = 0.83$) has the highest ductility but the stress drop is also the most abrupt. This indicates that for this material the succession of events from the onset of failure to final collapse is faster, and thus failure is more catastrophic than in a porous von Mises material ($k = 0$) or in the porous material for which the plastic flow in the matrix is characterized by $k = 0.3$ ($\sigma_T/\sigma_c = 1.21$). The same conclusion can be drawn by examining the void volume fraction evolution (Fig. 4), the rate of void growth (Fig. 5), and the extent of the critical zone (depicted in Fig. 6). Indeed, for the material with $k = -0.3$ ($\sigma_T/\sigma_c = 0.83$) the rate of void growth is almost constant for most of the deformation process, i.e. until a macroscopic effective strain is reached at which the rate of void growth starts increasing very rapidly marking the onset of failure. Also, it is very worth noting that for this material the “critical zone” is very limited, the macroscopic effective strain $E_e$ corresponding to the onset of failure being close to that at which final collapse occurs (see Fig. 7). In contrast, for the porous von Mises material ($k = 0$; $\sigma_T/\sigma_c = 1$) and for the porous material characterized by $k = 0.3$ ($\sigma_T/\sigma_c = 1.23$), damage accumulation is more gradual. The results presented highlight the difficulty in evaluating the life in service of
metallic components, i.e. the value of the porosity (damage level) alone is not sufficient to estimate the safety of a given structural part.

The paramount importance played by the plastic flow of the matrix on the ductility of the porous solids is clearly seen. For the porous material characterized by $k = -0.3$, the rate of void growth is significantly lower (see Fig. 4) than in the other two materials, the macroscopic strain at the onset of failure being more than three times higher than in a material with $k = 0.3$ (see Fig. 5). On the other hand, in the latter material ($k = 0.3$), the void growth is most rapid, which explains its reduced ductility (see also Fig. 3-4).

To better understand the reasons for the very strong difference in void evolution between the three porous materials, we compare the local state fields corresponding to the same level of macroscopic true strain $E_e = 0.15$. Note that this strain level corresponds to the early stages of the deformation process where macroscopically only a very slight difference in the stress-strain response of the three materials can be observed (see Fig. 3). Fig. 8 shows the contours of constant local equivalent plastic strain, $\tilde{\varepsilon}^p$, corresponding to $E_e = 0.15$. The local plastic strain $\tilde{\varepsilon}^p$ is the work-equivalent conjugate of the effective stress according to the yield criterion for the matrix, given by Eq. (1), i.e.

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}^p(\sigma) = \sqrt{\frac{9}{2(3k^2 - 2k + 3)}} \sum_{i=1}^{3} (|\sigma_i| - k \sigma_i)^{2}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

Because of the drastic difference in the level of local plastic strains that develop in the three materials and in order to be able to better distinguish the distribution of the plastic zones within the domain while having the same scale for all materials (i.e. the same maximum and minimum levels for $\tilde{\varepsilon}^p$), we present separately isocontours corresponding to $\tilde{\varepsilon}^p \leq 0.01$ (upper Fig. 8) and $0.01 \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}^p \leq 0.91$, respectively.

Examination of the upper part of Fig. 8 reveals that in the porous polycrystal characterized by $k = -0.3$ ($\sigma_T/\sigma_c = 0.83$) the entire domain (cell) has yielded. However, for the porous von Mises ($\sigma_T/\sigma_c = 1$) and the porous polycrystal characterized by $k = 0.3$ ($\sigma_T/\sigma_c = 1.21$), there exists a zone in the vicinity of the void along the vertical axis of the
cross-section (Oz) where yielding did not occur. Specifically, for the porous von Mises material the elastic zone is contiguous to the void while for the material characterized by $k = 0.3$ the elastic zone is slightly shifted upwards from the void. Examination of the contours of local plastic strain corresponding to $0.01 \leq \varepsilon^p \leq 0.91$ shows very marked differences in terms of the heterogeneity of plastic deformation and the distribution of the plastic zones within the domain. Note that for the porous material with matrix characterized by $k = -0.3$ ($\sigma_T/\sigma_c = 0.83$), the plastic deformation is more homogeneous than in the other materials. In contrast, at the same level of the macroscopic equivalent strain (Ee), in the porous von Mises material ($k = 0$) and in the porous material with matrix characterized by $k = 0.3$, the strain gradients are much stronger. The highest levels of local plastic deformation and most heterogeneity are found in the material characterized by $k = +0.3$ ($\sigma_T/\sigma_c = 1.21$). A measure of the heterogeneity in plastic deformation within the domain is the ratio between the maximum local plastic strain in the entire domain, $\varepsilon_{\text{max}}^p$, and the average of the local plastic strain, $\langle \varepsilon^p \rangle$ defined as:

$$
\langle \varepsilon^p \rangle = \frac{1}{V} \int_V \varepsilon^p \, dV
$$

(12)

The highest is the ratio $\varepsilon_{\text{max}}^p / \langle \varepsilon^p \rangle$, the most heterogeneity there is. For the materials with $k = +0.3$, $k=0$, and $k = -0.3$, these ratios are 5.95, 5.4, and 4.16, respectively. Again the highest ratio (highest heterogeneity) is observed in the material with $k = +0.3$ ($\sigma_T/\sigma_c = 1.21$), while the lowest is in the material with $k = -0.3$ ($\sigma_T/\sigma_c = 0.83$). For the sake of completeness, Fig. 9 shows the evolution of the strain heterogeneity ratio $\varepsilon_{\text{max}}^p / \langle \varepsilon^p \rangle$ with the macroscopic equivalent strain Ee for the three porous materials. It can be concluded that through the entire deformation process, the local heterogeneity is always the lowest in the material with matrix characterized by $k = -0.3$. Moreover, the distribution of the local stresses is markedly different depending on the characteristics of the plastic flow of the matrix, i.e. the value of k. Contours of constant mean stress $\sigma_m/Y_0$ are shown in Fig. 10. Note that in the porous material with matrix characterized by $k = +
0.3 ($\sigma_t/\sigma_c = 1.21$), the local mean stress, $\sigma_m/Y_0$, is positive in the entire domain while in the material with $k = -0.3$ ($\sigma_t/\sigma_c = 0.83$) which is fully plastified, zones of negative (compressive) mean stress develop near the cavity. As a consequence, for the latter material void growth is slowed down as compared to the porous material with matrix characterized by $k = +0.3$. This correlates very well with the results presented in Fig. 3-4, in particular it explains the differences in porosity evolution between the three materials.

In conclusion, although all porous materials were subjected to the same macroscopic tensile loading history corresponding to a constant macroscopic stress triaxiality $T_\Sigma$ =1 and constant $\mu_\Sigma = 1$ ($J^\Sigma_3 > 0$) during the entire deformation process, the specificities of the plastic flow of the matrix dramatically affect the local state. All the results presented highlight the strong correlation between the value of the macroscopic parameter $k$ and the local plastic strain heterogeneity, which in turn leads to markedly different void evolution and ultimately ductility of the porous materials (see Fig. 3-4).

4. Analysis of the porosity evolution and its effects on the ductility of porous materials under macroscopic axisymmetric tensile loading corresponding to $T_\Sigma$ =1 and $\mu_\Sigma = -1$ ($\Sigma_1=\Sigma_2$ and $\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 =0.25$)

Before starting the analysis of this new loading case, an important statement is mandatory in order to drive the reader through the analysis of the new results. In the loading case previously analyzed, i.e. $T_\Sigma$ =1 and $\mu_\Sigma = +1$, the slower void growth evolution and larger ductility was predicted for the porous material with matrix characterized by $k = -0.3$. Next, we examine the effect of the loading history, namely of the third-invariant on the dilatational response of the same materials. The macroscopic loading that is imposed corresponds to the same value of the stress triaxiality, i.e. $T_\Sigma$ =1, but to opposite value of the Lode angle i.e. $\mu_\Sigma = -1$ ($J^\Sigma_3 < 0$) during the entire deformation process. Specifically, the imposed macroscopic loading corresponds to the following ratios between the macroscopic principal stresses: $\Sigma_1=\Sigma_2$ and $\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 0.25$. 
For this loading case, first comparison between the macroscopic equivalent stress $\Sigma_e$ vs. macroscopic equivalent strain $E_e$ curves, obtained using the cell model for the three materials is presented (Fig. 11). The evolution of the void volume fraction and the rate of void growth as a function of the macroscopic effective strain $E_e$, respectively are shown in Fig. 12-13. Note that the specificities of the plastic flow of the matrix described by the parameter $k$ affect every aspect of the mechanical response of the porous solid. For this macroscopic stress path history, i.e. $T_\Sigma = 1$ and $\mu_\Sigma = -1$, the fastest void growth rate and lowest ductility is now attained by the porous material characterized by $k = -0.3$ ($\sigma_T/\sigma_c = 0.83$), which is exactly the opposite of what was found for macroscopic loadings corresponding to $T_\Sigma = 1$ and $\mu_\Sigma = +1$. Indeed, for macroscopic loading such that $T_\Sigma = 1$ and $\mu_\Sigma = -1$, for the porous material with matrix characterized by $k = -0.3$ ($\sigma_T/\sigma_c = 0.83$), the onset of failure is detected at $E_e = 0.35$, which is only about one-third of the maximum ductility observed for the porous material with matrix characterized by $k = +0.3$ ($\sigma_T/\sigma_c = 1.21$). Furthermore, for this macroscopic loading the porous von Mises material ($k = 0; \sigma_T/\sigma_c = 1$) and the porous material with matrix characterized by $k = +0.3$ ($\sigma_T/\sigma_c = 1.21$) exhibit enhanced ductility. This correlates well with the void volume fraction evolution (see Fig. 12) and the rate of void growth in each material (Fig. 13).

Indeed, in the material with matrix characterized by $k = -0.3$ ($\sigma_T/\sigma_c = 0.83$) the void grows much faster than in the other materials and at some point in the deformation process, there is a rapid increase in void volume fraction (see Fig. 13) which corresponds to the drop in the macroscopic effective stress (see Fig. 11). However, in the porous von Mises material ($k = 0; \sigma_T/\sigma_c = 1$), the void grows much slower than in the material with matrix characterized by $k = -0.3$ ($\sigma_T/\sigma_c = 0.83$), the rate of void growth being always lower for the entire deformation process. Most importantly, considerable differences can be noticed at the levels of porosity at the onset of failure, respectively $f = 0.054$, $f = 0.037$ and $f = 0.036$ for the porous material with matrix characterized by $k = +0.3$, the porous von Mises material ($k = 0$), and the porous material with matrix characterized by $k = -0.3$. These differences are even more significant if the comparison is carried out for the levels
of porosity determined at the final collapse, being in this case, for the same abovementioned three materials, of respectively $f = 0.091$, $f = 0.059$ and $f = 0.050$.

To gain understanding of this very important difference in the porosity evolution between the three materials, we also examined the distribution of the local equivalent plastic strains (Fig. 14) and local mean stresses (Fig. 15) in each material corresponding to the same level of macroscopic effective strain $E_e = 0.20$. It is very worth noting that in the material where there is the least plastic heterogeneity, which is the material with $k = +0.3$, there is little damage accumulation (see also Fig 12). For this material, the mean stress $\sigma_m / Y_0$ distribution is also more homogeneous (see Fig. 15). In contrast, in the material with $k = -0.3$, the local plastic work heterogeneity is much higher (Fig. 14), the levels of mean stress and their gradients being also much higher than in the other cases (see Fig. 15). The evolution of the local strain heterogeneity ratio $\bar{\varepsilon}_{\max} / \langle \dot{\varepsilon}^p \rangle$ with the macroscopic equivalent strain $E_e$ for the three materials is shown in Fig. 16. For each material $\bar{\varepsilon}_{\max}$ is the maximum local plastic strain in the cell while $\langle \dot{\varepsilon}^p \rangle$ is the average of the local plastic strain in the cell. Note that irrespective of the level of the macroscopic strain $E_e$, the local plastic strain heterogeneity is most pronounced in the material with $k = -0.3$ while in the material with $k = +0.3$ the local plastic strain is almost homogeneous for most of the deformation process.

Another important finding concerns the macroscopic stress-strain response after the onset of failure. While for tensile loading such that $T_\Sigma = 1$ and $\mu_\Sigma = +1$, for all materials a drop of the macroscopic stress and a sudden increase of void growth rate was clearly observable (see Figs. 3 and 5, respectively), which in turn induced a more catastrophic failure, in the case of tensile loadings at the same triaxiality $T_\Sigma = 1$ but with $\mu_\Sigma = -1$, damage accumulates more gradually (more smoothly) and sudden changes are not observable.

While we have presented in detail the case of tensile loadings at $T_\Sigma = 1$, which shows the very strong link between the tension-compression asymmetry ratio of the matrix (sign of $k$) and the rate of porosity evolution for a given loading path, the same conclusions hold true for any triaxiality $T_\Sigma > 0$. As an example, in Fig. 17 (a)-(b) is shown a comparison
between the porosity evolution for the porous materials with matrix characterized by $k = -0.3$ and $k=0.3$, respectively for macroscopic loadings corresponding to $T_\Sigma = 2$ and $T_\Sigma = 2/3$ for both positive and negative values of the Lode parameter (i.e. for $\mu_\Sigma = \pm 1$). Note that irrespective of the value of the triaxiality, for the material characterized by $k = -0.3$ ($\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83$), the rate of void growth is much slower for tensile loadings with $\mu_\Sigma = 1$ than for tensile loadings with $\mu_\Sigma = -1$, while the reverse holds true for materials characterized by $k = +0.3$ ($\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.23$). At the same triaxiality, for loadings such that $\mu_\Sigma = 1$, the fastest void growth rate occurs in the material characterized by $k = +0.3$ ($\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21$); on the other hand, for loadings such that $\mu_\Sigma = -1$, the fastest void growth rate occurs in the material characterized by $k = -0.3$. Furthermore, the most difference in porosity evolution between the porous materials occurs for tensile loadings characterized by $\mu_\Sigma = 1$.

5. Conclusions

In this paper, the effect of the tension-compression asymmetry of the plastic flow of the incompressible matrix on porosity evolution and the overall ductility of porous materials was assessed for the first time. The plastic flow of the incompressible matrix was considered to obey the isotropic form of Cazacu et al. (2006)’s yield criterion. This yield criterion is pressure-insensitive, it involves all principal values of the Cauchy stress deviator, and a scalar material parameter, $k$, which is intimately related to specific single-crystal plastic deformation mechanisms. 3-D FE unit cell analyses were conducted. The imposed macroscopic loadings were such that the principal values of the macroscopic stresses, $\Sigma_1$, $\Sigma_2$, $\Sigma_3$ followed a prescribed proportional loading history. Detailed analyses were presented for tensile loadings corresponding to ($\Sigma_1=\Sigma_2$ and $\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 =2.5$) and ($\Sigma_1=\Sigma_2$ and $\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 =0.25$), which corresponds to the same value of the stress triaxiality, $T_\Sigma = 1$ and the Lode parameter $\mu_\Sigma = +1$ and $\mu_\Sigma = -1$. It was clearly shown that irrespective of the imposed macroscopic loading, the tension-compression asymmetry in the plastic flow of the matrix, described by the parameter $k$, has a very strong influence on all aspects of the mechanical response of the porous solids.
Furthermore, a very strong effect of the loading path, in particular of the Lode parameter on porosity evolution and ultimately the material’s ductility was observed. Specifically, for $\mu_\Sigma = +1$ ($J_3 > 0$), the porous material with matrix characterized by $k = -0.3$ (yield in tension less than in compression: $\sigma_T / \sigma_C = 0.83$) has the highest ductility (~300% more than the material with $k = +0.3$ ($\sigma_T / \sigma_C = 1.21$) but the “critical zone” in the deformation process (from the onset of failure to failure) is more limited, the macroscopic effective strain $\varepsilon_e$ corresponding to coalescence being closer to that at which failure occurs. In contrast, for the porous von Mises material ($k = 0$; $\sigma_T / \sigma_C = 1$) and for the porous material characterized by $k = +0.3$ ($\sigma_T / \sigma_C = 1.21$), damage is more gradual. Most importantly, although at the macroscopic level there is very little difference in the macroscopic stress-strain response between the porous materials, the differences in the local state fields are very pronounced. On the other hand, for the same triaxiality, but $\mu_\Sigma = -1$, comparison between the rate of void growth and ductility in the same materials lead to completely different findings: only the porous material, which is characterized by $k = -0.3$ ($\sigma_T / \sigma_C = 0.83$) displays softening; furthermore, this material has the lowest ductility. While the case of macroscopic loadings at fixed triaxiality $T_\Sigma = 1$ was analyzed in detail, the same conclusions can be drawn for all positive triaxialities, namely that:

a) Irrespective of the loading path (i.e. whether $\mu_\Sigma = -1$ or $\mu_\Sigma = 1$), there is a very strong link between the tension-compression asymmetry ratio of the plastic flow of the matrix (sign of $k$) and the rate of porosity evolution.

b) for the material with matrix characterized by $k = +0.3$, the rate of void growth is faster for $\mu_\Sigma = +1$ than for $\mu_\Sigma = -1$ while for the material characterized by $k = -0.3$, the opposite holds true.

c) for the same positive triaxiality: for $\mu_\Sigma = +1$ the slowest rate of void growth is observed in the porous material with matrix characterized by $k = -0.3$, while for $\mu_\Sigma = -1$, the slowest rate of void growth is observed for the material with $k = +0.3$.

d) for the same triaxiality, for loadings such that $\mu_\Sigma = 1$, the fastest void growth rate occurs in the material characterized by $k = +0.3$ ($\sigma_T / \sigma_C = 1.21$); on the other hand, for
loadings such that $\mu_s = -1$, the fastest void growth rate occurs in the material characterized by $k = -0.3$.

e) The most pronounced difference in porosity evolution between the porous materials (i.e. the strongest influence of the matrix plastic flow) is observed for tensile loadings characterized by $\mu_s = 1$.

Thus, a very clear correlation has been established between a macroscopic material parameter that is intimately related to the particularities of the plastic flow of the matrix and the rate of void growth. Moreover, the simulations results provide insights onto material design such as to control "damage" under given macroscopic loading conditions. While in the examples shown here the source of tension-compression asymmetry of the matrix was due to twinning at single-crystal level, this strength-differential in the matrix may arise from other single-crystal plasticity mechanisms, e.g. when different components of the applied stress affect the single crystal plastic deformation by climb and glide (Lebensohn et al., 2010).
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Figure Captions:

Figure 1: Representation in the octahedral plane of the yield locus according to the isotropic form of Cazacu et al. (2006) criterion for fully-dense polycrystals with uniform texture deforming solely by twinning in comparison with the von Mises criterion (k = 0 in Eq.(1)): (a) k = -0.3 and (b) k = +0.3.

Figure 2: (a) Schematic two-dimensional projection of the three-dimensional cubic cell model adopted in this study; 2 C_0 and r_0 denote the length of the undeformed cubic cell and the initial radius of the spherical void, respectively. (b) Finite-element mesh of one-eighth of the unit cell with a spherical void at its center.

Figure 3: Comparison between the macroscopic stress-strain response (equivalent stress $\Sigma_e$ vs macroscopic equivalent strain $E_e$) obtained by cell calculations for voided polycrystals with matrix characterized by different tension-compression asymmetry ratios: $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83$, (k = -0.3), von Mises material $\sigma_T = \sigma_C = 1$ (same response in tension and compression: k = 0); $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21$, (k = +0.3) for axisymmetric tensile loadings ($\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2$ and $\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 2.5$) corresponding to a fixed triaxiality $T_\Sigma = 1$ and $\mu_\Sigma = 1$. Black dots mark the onset of failure.

Figure 4: Evolution of the void volume fraction with the macroscopic equivalent strain $E_e$, obtained by cell calculations for porous polycrystals with matrix characterized by different tensile/compression asymmetry ratios: $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83$, (k = -0.3), von Mises material $\sigma_T = \sigma_C = 1$ (same response in tension and compression: k = 0); $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21$, (k = +0.3) for axisymmetric tensile loadings ($\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2$ and $\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 2.5$) corresponding to a fixed triaxiality $T_\Sigma = 1$ and $\mu_\Sigma = 1$. Black dots mark the onset of failure.

Figure 5: Evolution of the void growth rate ($\dot{f}$) with the macroscopic equivalent strain $E_e$, obtained by cell calculations for porous polycrystals with matrix characterized by different tensile/compression asymmetry ratios: $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83$, (k = -0.3), von Mises material $\sigma_T = \sigma_C = 1$ (same response in tension and compression: k = 0); $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21$, (k = +0.3) for axisymmetric tensile loadings ($\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2$ and $\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 2.5$) corresponding to a fixed triaxiality $T_\Sigma = 1$ and $\mu_\Sigma = 1$. The black and white dots mark the onset of failure and failure, respectively. Note that the rate of void growth is significantly lower for the material with k = -0.3, and the strain at the onset of failure is at strains about three times higher than in the material characterized by k = +0.3.

Figure 6: Evolution of the load carrying cross-section with the macroscopic strain $E_e$ (solid line) and $\delta \ln \left( \frac{C_0}{C_e(C_2)} \right)$ vs. $E_e$ (interrupted line), respectively for the porous material characterized by $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21$ (k = +0.3) for axisymmetric tensile loadings $\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2$ and $\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 2.5$ corresponding to a fixed triaxiality $T_\Sigma = 1$. The onset of failure corresponds to the strain at which there is an abrupt change in the slope of the $\delta \ln \left( \frac{C_0}{C_e(C_2)} \right)$ vs. $E_e$ curve (see interrupted line) while collapse takes place when the
In \([(C_0^2/C_1C_2)]\) vs. \(E_e\) curve reaches a maximum. The critical phase of the deformation process, where accelerated damage accumulation occurs is highlighted.

**Figure 7:** Evolution of the effective load carrying cross-section (cell cross-section minus the void) with the macroscopic strain \(E_e\) for porous materials with matrix characterized by different tensile/compression asymmetry ratios: \(\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83, (k = -0.3)\), von Mises material \(\sigma_T = \sigma_C = 1\) (same response in tension and compression: \(k = 0\)); \(\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21, (k = +0.3)\) for axisymmetric tensile loadings (\(\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2\) and \(\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 2.5\)) corresponding to a fixed triaxiality \(T_\Sigma = 1\) and \(\mu_e = 1\). The black and white dots mark the onset of failure and total loss of load carrying capacity, respectively. Note that this critical zone (onset of failure to final collapse) is very limited for the material with \(k = -0.3\) (\(\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83\)), damage accumulation in the other two materials being more gradual.

**Figure 8:** Isocontours of the local effective equivalent plastic strain \(\bar{e}^p\) corresponding to the same value of the macroscopic strain \(E_e = 0.15\) for the three porous materials with matrix characterized by different tension-compression asymmetry ratios: \(\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83, (k = -0.3)\), von Mises material \(\sigma_T = \sigma_C = 1\) (same response in tension and compression: \(k = 0\)); \(\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21, (k = +0.3)\) for axisymmetric tensile loadings (\(\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2\) and \(\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 2.5\)) corresponding to a fixed triaxiality \(T_\Sigma = 1\) and \(\mu_e = 1\). Upper figure corresponds to \(0 \leq \bar{e}^p \leq 0.01\); lower figure correspond to \(0.01 \leq \bar{e}^p \leq 0.91\). The white regions in the lower figure mark the elastic zones; only in the material with \(k = -0.3\), the entire domain is plastic.

**Figure 9:** Evolution of the plastic heterogeneity \(\bar{e}^p_{\max}/\langle \bar{e}^p \rangle\) with the macroscopic equivalent strain \(E_e\), obtained by FE cell calculations for the three porous materials with matrix characterized by different tension-compression asymmetry ratios: \(\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83, (k = -0.3)\), von Mises material \(\sigma_T = \sigma_C = 1\) (same response in tension and compression: \(k = 0\)); \(\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21, (k = +0.3)\) for axisymmetric tensile loadings (\(\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2\) and \(\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 2.5\)) corresponding to a fixed triaxiality \(T_\Sigma = 1\) and \(\mu_e = 1\). The black and white dots mark the onset of failure and final collapse, respectively. Note that for the same macroscopic loading, the local plastic heterogeneity in the three materials is markedly different.

**Figure 10:** Isocontours of the local normalized mean stress \(\sigma^m/Y_0\) for the three porous materials with matrix characterized by the following tension-compression asymmetry ratios: \(\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83, (k = -0.3)\), von Mises material \(\sigma_T = \sigma_C = 1\) (same response in tension and compression: \(k = 0\)); \(\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21, (k = +0.3)\) for axisymmetric tensile loadings (\(\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2\) and \(\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 2.5\)) corresponding to a fixed triaxiality \(T_\Sigma = 1\) and \(\mu_e = 1\). Only in the material with \(k = -0.3\) (\(\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83\)), there is an extended zone of negative (compressive) pressure that develops contiguous to the void.

**Figure 11:** Comparison between the macroscopic stress-strain response (equivalent stress \(\Sigma_e\) vs macroscopic equivalent strain \(E_e\)) obtained by cell calculations for porous polycrystals with matrix characterized by different tension-compression asymmetry ratios:
\[ \sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83, \ (k = -0.3), \text{ von Mises material } \sigma_T = \sigma_C = 1 \text{ (same response in tension and compression: } k = 0); \sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21, \ (k = +0.3) \text{ for axisymmetric tensile loadings (} \Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2 \text{ and } \Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 0.25) \text{ corresponding to a fixed triaxiality } T_\Sigma = 1 \text{ and } \mu_\Sigma = -1 \ (J_3^e < 0). \text{ Black dots mark the onset of failure.}

**Figure 12:** Evolution of the void volume fraction with the macroscopic equivalent strain \( E_\varepsilon \), obtained by cell calculations for porous polycrystals with matrix characterized by different tension-compression asymmetry ratios: \( \sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83, \ (k = -0.3), \text{ von Mises material } \sigma_T = \sigma_C = 1 \text{ (same response in tension and compression: } k = 0); \sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21, \ (k = +0.3) \text{ for axisymmetric tensile loadings (} \Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2 \text{ and } \Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 0.25) \text{ corresponding to a fixed triaxiality } T_\Sigma = 1 \text{ and } \mu_\Sigma = -1 \ (J_3^e < 0). \text{ The black and white dots mark the onset of failure and failure, respectively.}

**Figure 13:** Evolution of the void growth rate \( \dot{f} \) with the macroscopic equivalent strain \( E_\varepsilon \), obtained by cell calculations for voided polycrystals with matrix characterized by different tension-compression asymmetry ratios: \( \sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83, \ (k = -0.3), \text{ von Mises material } \sigma_T = \sigma_C = 1 \text{ (same response in tension and compression: } k = 0); \sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21, \ (k = +0.3) \text{ for axisymmetric tensile loadings (} \Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2 \text{ and } \Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 0.25) \text{ corresponding to a fixed triaxiality } T_\Sigma = 1 \text{ and } \mu_\Sigma = -1 \ (J_3^e < 0). \text{ The black and white dots mark the onset of failure and failure, respectively. Note that for this loading, the material characterized by } k = +0.3 \text{ has a much lower rate of void growth than the other materials.}

**Figure 14:** Isocontours of the local effective equivalent plastic strain \( \varepsilon^p \) corresponding to the same value of the macroscopic strain \( E_\varepsilon = 0.2 \): material with matrix characterized by \( \sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83; k = -0.3, \text{ von Mises material (same response in tension and compression: } \sigma_T = \sigma_C = 1; k = 0)\), material with matrix characterized by \( \sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21, \ k = +0.3 \text{ for axisymmetric tensile loadings (} \Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2 \text{ and } \Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 0.25) \text{ corresponding to a fixed triaxiality } T_\Sigma = 1 \text{ and } \mu_\Sigma = -1 \ (J_3^e < 0). \text{ Remark the noticeable differences between materials in terms of } \text{ maximum and minimum equivalent local plastic strain values and ranges of plastic heterogeneity } \left( \overline{\varepsilon^p_{\text{max}}} - \overline{\varepsilon^p_{\text{min}}} \right). \text{ The white areas shown for the material with } k = +0.3 \text{ and } k = 0 \text{ represent either } \varepsilon^p < 0.15 \text{ or } \varepsilon^p > 0.95. \text{ Vertical axial axis is along the } Oz \text{ direction, horizontal axis along the } Ox \text{ direction.}

**Figure 15:** Isocontours of the normalized local means stress \( \sigma_m/Y_0 \), corresponding to the same value of the macroscopic strain \( E_\varepsilon = 0.2 \) for the three porous materials with matrix characterized by different tensile/compression asymmetry ratios: \( \sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83 \ (k = -0.3), \text{ von Mises material (same response in tension and compression: } \sigma_T = \sigma_C = 1; k = 0)\), material with matrix characterized by \( \sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21, \ k = +0.3 \text{ for axisymmetric tensile loadings (} \Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2 \text{ and } \Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 0.25) \text{ corresponding to a fixed triaxiality } T_\Sigma = 1 \text{ and } \mu_\Sigma = -1 \ (J_3^e < 0). \)
Figure 16: Evolution of the local strain heterogeneity ratio $\frac{\overline{\varepsilon} \equiv \varepsilon}{\varepsilon_{\text{max}}}$ with the macroscopic effective strain $E_e$ for the three porous materials with matrix characterized by different tensile/compression asymmetry ratios: $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83$ ( $k = -0.3$), von Mises material (same response in tension and compression: $\sigma_T = \sigma_C = 1$; $k = 0$), material with matrix characterized by $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21$, ( $k = +0.3$) for axisymmetric tensile loadings ($\Sigma_1=\Sigma_2$ and $\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 0.25$) corresponding to a fixed triaxiality $T_\Sigma = 1$ and $\mu_\Sigma = -1$ ($J_3^{\Sigma} < 0$). The black and white dots mark the onset of failure and failure, respectively.

Figure 17: Role of the third-invariant on porosity evolution for porous materials with matrix characterized by different tensile/compression asymmetry ratios: $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83$ ( $k = -0.3$), von Mises material (same response in tension and compression: $\sigma_T = \sigma_C = 1$; $k = 0$), material with matrix characterized by $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21$, ( $k = +0.3$) for axisymmetric tensile loadings ($\Sigma_1=\Sigma_2$ and $\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 0.25$) corresponding to fixed triaxiality (a) $T_\Sigma = 2$; (b) $T_\Sigma = 2/3$. For loadings such that $J_3^{\Sigma} > 0$ ( $\mu_\Sigma = 1$), the fastest void growth rate occurs in the material characterized by $k =+0.3$ while for loadings such that $J_3^{\Sigma} < 0$ ( $\mu_\Sigma = -1$), the fastest void growth rate occurs in the material characterized by $k =-0.3$. 
Figure 1: Representation in the octahedral plane of the yield locus according to the isotropic form of Cazacu et al. (2006) criterion for fully-dense polycrystals with uniform texture deforming solely by twinning in comparison with the von Mises criterion ($k = 0$ in Eq.(1)): (a) $k = -0.3$ and (b) $k = + 0.3$. 

(a) Isotropic fully-dense FCC twinning only ($k = -0.3$) 

(b) Isotropic fully-dense BCC twinning only ($k = 0.3$)
Figure 2: (a) Schematic two-dimensional projection of the three-dimensional cubic cell model adopted in this study; $2C_0$ and $r_0$ denote the length of the undeformed cubic cell and the initial radius of the spherical void, respectively. (b) Finite-element mesh of one-eighth of the unit cell with a spherical void at its center.
Figure 3: Comparison between the macroscopic stress-strain response (equivalent stress $\Sigma_e$ vs macroscopic equivalent strain $E_e$) obtained by cell calculations for voided polycrystals with matrix characterized by different tensile/compression asymmetry ratios: $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83$, (k = -0.3), von Mises material $\sigma_T = \sigma_C = 1$ (same response in tension and compression: k = 0); $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21$, (k = +0.3) for axisymmetric tensile loadings ($\Sigma_1=\Sigma_2$ and $\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 2.5$) corresponding to a fixed triaxiality $T_\Sigma = 1$ and $\mu_\Sigma = 1$. Black dots mark the onset of failure.
**Figure 4:** Evolution of the void volume fraction with the macroscopic equivalent strain $E_e$, obtained by cell calculations for porous polycrystals with matrix characterized by different tensile/compression asymmetry ratios: $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83$, (k = -0.3), von Mises material $\sigma_T = \sigma_C = 1$ (same response in tension and compression: k = 0); $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21$, (k = +0.3) for axisymmetric tensile loadings ($\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2$ and $\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 2.5$) corresponding to a fixed triaxiality $T_3 = 1$ and $\mu_z = 1$. Black dots mark the onset of failure.
**Figure 5**: Evolution of the void growth rate ($\dot{f}$) with the macroscopic equivalent strain $E_e$, obtained by cell calculations for porous polycrystals with matrix characterized by different tensile/compression asymmetry ratios: $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83$, ($k = -0.3$), von Mises material $\sigma_T = \sigma_C = 1$ (same response in tension and compression: $k = 0$); $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21$, ($k = + 0.3$) for axisymmetric tensile loadings ($\Sigma_1=\Sigma_2$ and $\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 =2.5$) corresponding to a fixed triaxiality $T_\Sigma = 1$ and $\mu_\Sigma = 1$. The black and white dots mark the onset of failure and final collapse, respectively. Note that the rate of void growth is significantly lower for the material with $k = -0.3$, and the strain at the onset of failure is at a strain level about three times higher than in the material characterized by $k = + 0.3$. 
Figure 6: Evolution of the load carrying cross-section with the macroscopic strain $E_e$ (solid line) and $\delta \ln\left(\frac{C_0^2}{C_1 C_2}\right)$ (interrupted line) vs. $E_e$, respectively for the porous material characterized by $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21$ ($k = +0.3$) for axisymmetric tensile loadings $\Sigma_1=\Sigma_2$ and $\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 =2.5$ corresponding to a fixed triaxiality $T_\Sigma =1$ and $\mu_\Sigma = 1$. The onset of failure corresponds to the strain at which there is a change in the slope of the $\delta \ln\left(\frac{C_0^2}{C_1 C_2}\right)$ vs. $E_e$ curve (see interrupted line) while collapse takes place when the $\ln\left(\frac{C_0^2}{C_1 C_2}\right)$ vs. $E_e$ curve reaches a maximum. The critical phase of the deformation process, where accelerated damage accumulation occurs is highlighted.
Figure 7: Evolution of the effective load carrying cross-section (cell cross-section minus the void) with the macroscopic strain $E_e$ for porous materials with matrix characterized by different tensile/compression asymmetry ratios: $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83$, (k = - 0.3), von Mises material $\sigma_T = \sigma_C =$ 1 (same response in tension and compression: k = 0); $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21$, (k = + 0.3) for axisymmetric tensile loadings ($\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2$ and $\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 2.5$) corresponding to a fixed triaxiality $T_\Sigma = 1$ and $\mu_\Sigma = 1$. The black and white dots mark the onset of failure and final collapse (or loss of load carrying capacity), respectively.
Figure 8: Isocontours of the local effective equivalent plastic strain $\bar{\varepsilon}^p$ corresponding to the same value of the macroscopic strain $\varepsilon_{eq} = 0.15$ for the three porous materials with matrix characterized by different tensile/compression asymmetry ratios: $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83$, (k = -0.3), von Mises material $\sigma_T = \sigma_C = 1$ (same response in tension and compression: k = 0); $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21$, (k = + 0.3) for axisymmetric tensile loadings ($\Sigma_1=\Sigma_2$ and $\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 2.5$) corresponding to a fixed triaxiality $\Sigma_T = 1$ and $\mu_T = 1$. Upper figure corresponds to $0 \leq \bar{\varepsilon}^p \leq 0.01$; lower figure correspond to $0.01 \leq \bar{\varepsilon}^p \leq 0.91$. The white regions in the lower figure mark the elastic zones; only in the material with k = -0.3, the entire domain is plastic.
Figure 9: Evolution of the plastic heterogeneity $\bar{\varepsilon}_{\text{max}}^{p}/\langle \bar{\varepsilon}^{p} \rangle$ with the macroscopic equivalent strain $E_e$, obtained by FE cell calculations for the three porous materials with matrix characterized by different tensile/compression asymmetry ratios: $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83$, ($k = -0.3$), von Mises material $\sigma_T = \sigma_C = 1$ (same response in tension and compression: $k = 0$); $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21$, ($k = +0.3$) for axisymmetric tensile loadings ($\Sigma_1=\Sigma_2$ and $\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1=2.5$) corresponding to a fixed triaxiality $T_\Sigma = 1$ and $\mu_C = 1$. The black and white dots mark the onset of failure and final collapse, respectively. Note that for the same macroscopic loading, the local plastic heterogeneity in the three materials is markedly different.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline k= +0.30 & k=0 & k = -0.30 & \frac{\sigma_m}{Y_0} \\ \hline \sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21 & \sigma_T = \sigma_C \ (\text{von Mises}) & \sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83 & \hline \end{tabular}

**Figure 10:** Isocontours of the local normalized mean stress $\sigma_m/Y_0$ for the three porous materials with matrix characterized by the following tensile/compression asymmetry ratios: $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83$, (k = -0.3), von Mises material $\sigma_T = \sigma_C = 1$ (same response in tension and compression: k = 0); $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21$, (k = + 0.3) for axisymmetric tensile loadings ($\Sigma_1=\Sigma_2$ and $\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 =2.5$) corresponding to a fixed triaxiality $T_\Sigma = 1$ and $\mu_\Sigma = 1$. Only in the material with k = - 0.3 ($\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83$), there is an extended zone of negative (compressive) mean stress that develops contiguous to the void.
Figure 11: Comparison between the macroscopic stress-strain response (equivalent stress $\Sigma_e$ vs macroscopic equivalent strain $E_e$) obtained by cell calculations for porous polycrystals with matrix characterized by different tensile/compression asymmetry ratios: $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83$, (k = -0.3), von Mises material $\sigma_T = \sigma_C = 1$ (same response in tension and compression: k = 0); $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21$, (k = +0.3) for axisymmetric tensile loadings ($\Sigma_1=\Sigma_2$ and $\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 0.25$) corresponding to a fixed triaxiality $T_\Sigma = 1$ and $\mu_\Sigma = -1$ ($J_3^\Sigma < 0$). Black dots mark the onset of failure.
Figure 12: Evolution of the void volume fraction with the macroscopic equivalent strain \( E_e \), obtained by cell calculations for porous polycrystals with matrix characterized by different tensile/compression asymmetry ratios: \( \sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83, (k = -0.3) \), von Mises material \( \sigma_T = \sigma_C = 1 \) (same response in tension and compression: \( k = 0 \)); \( \sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21, (k = +0.3) \) for axisymmetric tensile loadings \( (\Sigma_1=\Sigma_2 \text{ and } \Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 0.25) \) corresponding to a fixed triaxiality \( T_\Sigma = 1 \) and \( \mu_\Sigma = -1 \) \( (J_3 < 0) \). The black dots mark the onset of failure.
Figure 13: Evolution of the void growth rate \( \dot{f} \) with the macroscopic equivalent strain \( E_e \), obtained by cell calculations for voided polycrystals with matrix characterized by different tensile/compression asymmetry ratios: \( \sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83 \) (\( k = -0.3 \)), von Mises material \( \sigma_T = \sigma_C = 1 \) (same response in tension and compression: \( k = 0 \)); \( \sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21 \) (\( k = +0.3 \)) for axisymmetric tensile loadings (\( \Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2 \) and \( \Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 0.25 \)) corresponding to a fixed triaxiality \( T_2 = 1 \) and \( \mu_z = -1 \) (\( J_3 < 0 \)). The black and white dots mark the onset of failure and final collapse, respectively. Note that for this loading, the material characterized by \( k = +0.3 \) has a much lower rate of void growth than the other materials.
Figure 14: Isocontours of the local effective equivalent plastic strain $\varepsilon^p$ corresponding to the same value of the macroscopic strain $E_e = 0.2$: material with matrix characterized by $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83$; $k = -0.3$, von Mises material (same response in tension and compression: $\sigma_T = \sigma_C = 1$; $k = 0$), material with matrix characterized by $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21$, $k = +0.3$ for axisymmetric tensile loadings ($\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2$ and $\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 0.25$) corresponding to a fixed triaxiality $T_\Sigma = 1$ and $\mu_z = -1$ ($J_3 < 0$). The white areas shown for the material with $k = +0.3$ and $k = 0$ represent either $\varepsilon^p < 0.15$ or $\varepsilon^p > 0.95$. Vertical axial axis is along the Oz direction, horizontal axis along the Ox direction.
Figure 15: Isocontours of the normalized local means stress $\frac{\sigma_m}{Y_0}$, corresponding to the same value of the macroscopic strain $E_e = 0.2$ for the three porous materials with matrix characterized by different tensile/compression asymmetry ratios: $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83$ (k = -0.3), von Mises material (same response in tension and compression: $\sigma_T = \sigma_C = 1$; k = 0), material with matrix characterized by $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21$, (k = +0.3) for axisymmetric tensile loadings ($\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2$ and $\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 0.25$) corresponding to a fixed triaxiality $T_\Sigma = 1$ and $\mu_\Sigma = -1$ ($J_3^\Sigma < 0$).
Figure 16: Evolution of the local strain heterogeneity ratio $\overline{\varepsilon^e} / \langle \overline{\varepsilon^e} \rangle$ with the macroscopic effective strain $E_e$ for the three porous materials with matrix characterized by different tensile/compression asymmetry ratios: $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83$ ($k = -0.3$), von Mises material (same response in tension and compression: $\sigma_T = \sigma_C = 1$; $k = 0$), material with matrix characterized by $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21$, ($k = +0.3$) for axisymmetric tensile loadings ($\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2$ and $\Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 0.25$) corresponding to a fixed triaxiality $T_\Sigma = 1$ and $\mu_\Sigma = -1$ ($J_3 < 0$). The black and white dots mark the onset of failure and final collapse, respectively.
Figure 17: Role of the third-invariant on porosity evolution for porous materials with matrix characterized by different tensile/compression asymmetry ratios: $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 0.83$ (k = -0.3), von Mises material (same response in tension and compression: $\sigma_T = \sigma_C = 1$; k = 0), material with matrix characterized by $\sigma_T/\sigma_C = 1.21$, (k = +0.3) for axisymmetric...
tensile loadings \( \Sigma_1=\Sigma_2 \) and \( \Sigma_3/\Sigma_1 = 0.25 \) corresponding to fixed triaxiality (a) \( T_x = 2 \); (b) \( T_x = 2/3 \). For loadings such that \( J_3^x > 0 \) (\( \mu_x = 1 \)), the fastest void growth rate occurs in the material characterized by \( k = +0.3 \) while for loadings such that \( J_3^x < 0 \) (\( \mu_x = -1 \)), the fastest void growth rate occurs in the material characterized by \( k = -0.3 \).